SINGLE BENCH

(1) 1/05 3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION NO. 1441 /2005

PETITIONER

Bahorik Ram Sahu, age about 20 (presently 45) years, son of Kallu Ram Sahu, Ex-Ad-hoc Assistant Teacher, Govt Primary School Dindori, Tah. Lormi, Distt. Bilaspur, r/o. Dindori, Lormi, Bilaspur.

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. The State of Chhattisgarh, through : the Secretary, Department of Education, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (CG)

P.R. No. 1438/05
Presented by Shri D. Tiwari
dated CM-CM-05

2. The Director, Lok Shikshan Sanchalnalay, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (CG)

3. The District Education Officer, Education Distt. Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)

4. The State of Madhya Pradesh through : the Secretary, Department of Education, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (Madhya Pradesh)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

24

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.1441/ **सन्** 2005

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	13-4-2005 Mr. A.N. Bhakta, counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Akhil Agrawal, Panel Lawyer for the State. Heard both the counsel. The case of the petitioner is that in the year 1981 the Education Department of the erstwhile State of Madhya Pradesh conducted a test for appointment of ad-hoc Assistant Teachers in the Government Primary Schools. In that test the petitioner was selected and accordingly, he was appointed for a period of three months on a fixed salary of Rs.300/- per month. However, the services of the petitioner were discontinued and the vacancy, which arose on account of discontinuation of the petitioner's services, was filled by the State of Madhya Pradesh. Thereafter, the petitioner is regularly making representations for considering the petitioner for appointment on the post of Teacher. Further case of the petitioner is that in the year 1997 the erstwhile State of M.P. took a decision to appoint ad-hoc teachers in place of Shiksha Karmi, but the same is not being implemented by the State of Chhattisgarh. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to respondent No.2 raising all his grievances and respondent No.2 be directed to decide his representation, to which learned counsel for the State of Chhattisgarh has no objection. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation to respondent No.2 within ten days from today raising all his grievances, and in turn, respondent No.2 is directed to consider the representation made by the petitioner and decide the same within a period of three months from the date of the receipt of the representation in an objective	

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

25

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.1441/ **सन्** 2005

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित — 2 —	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	manner after considering the grievances of the petitioner, in accordance with law. With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of. Consequently, M.(W.)P.No.1112/2005, I.A.Nos.2720/2005 and 2721/2005 also stand disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. **Sd/-** **L.C. Bhadoo** **Judge**	